

# Quotative Inversion in Peninsular Portuguese and Spanish, and in English\*

Gabriela Matos

Universidade de Lisboa (FLUL/CLUL). Centro de Linguística  
gmatos@fl.ul.pt



Received: July 27, 2013  
Accepted: September 9, 2013

## Abstract

Quotative parenthetical clauses exhibit a complement gap and, depending on the language, display obligatory or optional subject inversion. This paper presents exhaustive evidence that the quote does not originate as the complement of the parenthetical. Instead the parenthetical is an adjunct of the quote and may occupy different positions inside it. Thus, along with previous analyses, it is claimed that the object gap is a variable bound by a null operator recovered by the quote. The obligatory subject inversion in Peninsular Portuguese and Spanish quotative parentheticals is taken to be the result of structural constraints on focus: in these languages informational focus is constrained to postverbal positions, fronted focus being interpreted as contrastive. In contrast, in English preverbal focus is not restricted to contrastive focus and preverbal informational focus subjects are the most common pattern. Yet, English still allows postverbal informational focus subjects in some constructions, namely in Quotative Inversion.

**Keywords:** quotative parentheticals; quotative inversion; null complement; informational focus; Peninsular Spanish; European Portuguese.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4. A proposal on quotative parentheticals and quotative inversion
2. The proposals on the parenthetical and its correlation with the host clause	5. Final remarks
3. Previous analyses on subject inversion in quotative parentheticals	References

\* This research has been founded by FCT (projects PEst-OE/LIN/UI0022/2011 and PEst-OE/LIN/UI0214/2013). I would like to thank Alexandra Giorgi, Anthony Kroch and João Costa for comments on some of the proposals presented in this text. I specially thank an anonymous reviewer for his/her helpful remarks and suggestions on a previous version of this paper.

## 1. Introduction

Quotative parenthetical clauses in Peninsular Portuguese, henceforth European Portuguese, (1) and Peninsular Spanish (2) share with English (3) the property of typically presenting a complement gap (signalled by «[-]» in (1a), (2a) and (3a)), but differ from this language regarding the word order patterns available: while in European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish Subject Inversion (V-S) is required, as shown in (1) and (2), in English both V-S and S-V orders are allowed, see (3):

- (1) a. Saramago, disse o repórter [-], escreveu um livro sobre esse assunto.  
Saramago said the reporter wrote a book on that subject  
b. \*Saramago, o repórter disse, escreveu um livro sobre esse assunto.  
Saramago the reporter said wrote a book on that subject
- (2) a. «No, no es un enanito», rectifica el viejo [-].  
no, not is a gnome corrects the old man  
No, he is not a gnome, corrects the old man.  
[Son238, apud Suñer (2000)]  
b. \*«No, no es un enanito», el viejo rectifica.  
no, not is a gnome the old man corrects  
«No, he is not a gnome», the old man corrects.
- (3) a. «Don't turn back!» warned Marcel. [Collins and Branigan (1997)]  
b. '«Who's on first?» Joe demanded [-].'

Quotative Inversion presents several challenging properties: the mandatory V-S order in Spanish and European Portuguese seems to indicate that, in this construction, there is a correlation between the object gap and V-Movement; in contrast, the alternation S-V/V-S in English suggests that the object gap and V-Raising are two unrelated phenomena. In addition, classical approaches to Subject Inversion in declarative sentences in consistent Null Subject languages, have related this property to the Null Subject Parameter (e.g., Rizzi 1982, a.o.); however, in Quotative parentheticals, the availability of Subject Inversion in English and its obligatory nature in Peninsular Spanish and European Portuguese prevents this correlation. Finally, Quotative Inversion exhibits V-Movement of the main verb, an expected property in Spanish and Portuguese, but an exceptional one in contemporary English (Pollock 1989), where movement of main verbs out of vP is highly restricted.

The present paper will focus on two central issues of this construction: the correlation between the complement gap and the host sentence and the different word order patterns exhibited by European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish in contrast with English. These topics have already been approached for English (Collins 1997, Collins and Branigan 1997), European Portuguese (Ambar 1992) and Spanish (Suñer 2000), but they have not been exhaustively explored. In particular, the properties presented by the parenthetical and the host sentences have not

been extensively studied for the peninsular languages under study, and a consequent structural proposal that accounts for the connection between the parenthetical and its host sentence has not been provided. Moreover, none of the existing treatments deals with the contrasts in subject placement in English versus European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish.

This paper is structured as follows: section 2 discusses the main approaches in the literature to capture the correlation between the quote and the parenthetical clause, taking into account the data of European Portuguese and Spanish; section 3 examines the analyses on quotative inversion and the internal structure of the parenthetical presented for English and Spanish; section 4 proposes an analysis to account for the syntactic connection between the quotative parenthetical and the quote and to deal with the obligatory versus optional subject inversion in quotative parentheticals in European Portuguese and Spanish and in English; section 5 summarizes the main achievements of this work.

## 2. The proposals on the parenthetical and its correlation with the host clause

Early analyses of null complement parenthetical clauses presented two major alternatives to account for the relation between the parenthetical and the host clause: the Complement Hypothesis, proposed by Emonds (1970) and Ross (1973), and the Modifier Hypothesis, adopted by Jackendoff (1972).

According to Ross (1973), the parenthetical originates as a main clause, which verb takes the quote as its complement, as in (4); then this complement is fronted by an optional transformational rule, Slifting, which fronts the embedded sentence and deletes the complementizer *that*,<sup>1</sup> as in (5): according to Ross this rule Chomsky-adjoins the embedded sentence to the superordinate one (Ross 1973:134-135) thus resulting a coordinate-like structure, where the embedding clause is converted in a parenthetical (Ross 1973: 165-166).<sup>2</sup>

Finally another optional rule, called Niching, inserts the parenthetical into the first clause producing examples like (6) (Ross 1973: 166).

(4) John said that Mary will see you tomorrow.

(5) Mary will see you tomorrow, John said.

(6) a. Mary, John said, will see you tomorrow.

b. Mary will, John said, see you tomorrow

1. Ross formulates this rule as follows:

- (i) Slifting:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X - [S & Y - [S & \text{that} - S] ] - & Z \\ \text{SD: } 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & \Rightarrow (\text{optional}) \\ \text{SC: } & 1 & 4 \# [s & 2 & 0 & 0]s & 5 \end{array}$$

2. Ross does not present any details concerning the conversion of the subordinate clause into a coordinate-like one and how this one gets its parenthetic status.

In turn the *Modifier Hypothesis* (Jackendoff 1972: 98-100) assumes that the host clause is autonomous with respect to the parenthetical, the latter being a modifier related to its host as an adverbial that may occur in different positions inside a sentence, as illustrated for *probably* in (7), an example from Jackendoff (1972: 88):

- (7) a. Max probably was climbing the walls of the garden.  
 b. Max has probably been trying to decide whether to climb the walls of the garden.

Although departing from these hypotheses, current approaches to Quotative parentheticals retain some of their core ideas. In fact, the Complement Hypothesis is appealing because it directly correlates the verb gap with the host sentence. The Modifier Hypothesis is also attractive, since it aims at proposing a unified account of floating modifiers, which includes parenthetical clauses and other adverbial-like expressions.

Classically, each of these proposals corresponded to a different syntactic structure: the Complement Hypothesis was captured by a specifier-head-complement representation and the Modifier Hypothesis by an adjunction configuration. Still, in current analyses that take linearity as a consequence of asymmetric c-command (Kayne 1994) and project complements and modifiers into the same kind of structural configuration, the differences between these approaches have almost vanished and face identical problems.

### 2.1. *The specifier-head-complement analysis of complements and adjuncts*

Rooryck (2001) updates the complement approach to null complement parentheticals, trying to reconcile it with the idea that the parenthetical has an adverbial modifier status. Adopting Cinque's (1999) work, which relies on a specifier-head-complement analysis of adverbials, he claims that the host sentence is a CP, a complement of the parenthetical verb (8a), which moves, overtly or covertly, to the specifier of a modal evidential projection, MoodEvidP in (8b), followed by covert or overt raising of the verb to the head of this projection, accordingly surfacing the V-S (8c) or S-V (8b) word order pattern:

- (8) a. John said [CP Mary will see you tomorrow]  
 b. [CP [MoodEvidP [CPi Mary will see you tomorrow] [MoodEvid said] [TP John said-CPi]]  
 c. [CP [MoodEvidP [CPi Mary will see you tomorrow] [MoodEvid - ] [TP John said CPi]]

Still, as Rooryck (2001) recognizes, the specifier-head-complement approach faces the problem of dealing with interpolated parenthetical clauses as those in (6) or (9):

- (9) a. «Saramago ganhou, disse o repórter, o prêmio Nobel».  
Saramago won, said the reporter, the prize Nobel  
'Saramago won, said the reporter, the Nobel prize.'
- b. «Estoy cansada — dijo — y quiero irme a dormir»  
am tired — said — and want go.refl to sleep  
'I am tired — he/she said — and I want to sleep.'
- [Maldonado (1999: 3571)]

In fact, the rules of Slifting and Niching proposed by Ross (1973) are no longer an option. Current framework accepts constituent fronting. However this movement may not delete the overt complementizer of a displaced sentence, nor does it changes its categorial value, converting a C(omp) projection into a coordinate Conj(unction) projection. As for Niching, it is incompatible with the copy theory of displaced constituents. To adopt it would imply that in a sentence like (6b), repeated in (10a), after CP fronting (see (10b)), the alleged main clause that includes the copy of the fronted CP (CP<sub>i</sub> in (10c)) would move into the fronted embedded clause, leaving a copy, (TP<sub>2</sub> in (10c)):

- (10) a. Mary will, John said, see you tomorrow.  
 b. [CP [MoodEvidP [CP<sub>i</sub> Mary will see you tomorrow] [MoodEvid-]  
 [TP John said CP<sub>i</sub>]]]  
 c. [CP [MoodEvidP [CP<sub>i</sub> Mary will [TP<sub>j</sub> John said CP<sub>i</sub>] see you  
 tomorrow]<sub>1</sub> [MoodEvid-] TP<sub>j</sub>]]

Given that Transfer to the interface components operates on phases which are no longer required for the derivation, Transfer would only apply to CP2, i.e., to the whole propositional phase. However, in (10c), none of these copies is c-commanded by its antecedent and the derivation would be ruled out by Full Interpretation.

If we take an alternative analysis and derive interpolation as a partial movement of the alleged complement clause to the left periphery of the supposed main clause, we will face another problem: we will have to posit that non constituents may be moved, in order to account for examples like (6b) (see (11)):

- (11) [Mary will] [John said [CP [TP [DPMary] [Twill] see you tomorrow]]]

Still, within the specifier-head-complement approach, another analysis of interpolated parentheticals may be proposed. As a reviewer suggested, (10a) may be conceived as a two steps derivation: movement of the VP *see you tomorrow* to the left periphery of the embedded sentence, as in (12b), followed by movement of the rest of the sentence, presumably to the specifier of Mood\_EvidP, as in (12c):

- (12) a. [CP [MoodEvidP] [TP John said [CP Mary will [VP see you tomorrow]]]]  
 b. [CP [MoodEvidP] [TP John said [VP<sub>j</sub> see you tomorrow] [CP Mary will [VP<sub>j</sub>]]]]  
 c. [CP [MoodEvidP] [CP<sub>i</sub> Mary will [VP<sub>j</sub>]] [TP John said [VP<sub>i</sub> see you tomorrow] [CP<sub>j</sub>]]]]

The main problem with this proposal is the motivation for VP movement. Although this movement resembles VP-topicalization, a construction available in English embedded sentences (John said that *see you tomorrow*, Mary will),<sup>3</sup> it is difficult to assume that in (10a) the interface effect intended by the speaker is the one associated with VP topicalization. In particular, the fronting of the remaining CP ([CP Mary will [VP]]), in the next step of the derivation, in (12c), precludes this interpretation, since a topicalized phrase would require overt material in the sentence where it occurs. Therefore I will not adopt this proposal.

In addition, several empirical facts argue against the idea that the host clause starts as the embedded complement of the parenthetical verb. The autonomy of the host sentence has already been mentioned for different kinds of parentheticals in English (see, for instance Espinal 1991), and for quotative clauses in Spanish (Suñer 2000, Maldonado 1999). Suñer (2000: 527) underlines that the «direct quotes express the point of view of the speaker while indirect quotes present the point of view of the one who is doing the reporting». She stresses the need of deictic accommodations when direct reported speech is converted into indirect speech. The following examples from European Portuguese and Spanish illustrate these deictic accommodations:

- (13) a. **Eu** li esse livro, disse Mário.  
 I read.1ST.SG that book, said.3RD.SG Mário  
 b. Mário<sub>i</sub> disse que (**ele**)<sub>i</sub> leu esse livro.  
 Mário said.3RD.SG that he read.3RD.SG that book  
 c. Mário<sub>i</sub> disse que (**eu**)<sub>j</sub> li esse livro  
 Mário said that I read that book
- (14) a. No lo sé, me dijo.  
 not it know.1ST.SG, me told. 3RD.SG  
 'I don't know, he/she told me.'  
 b. Me dijo que no lo sabia.  
 Me told.3RD.SG that not it knew.3RD.SG  
 'He/she told me that he/she did not know it.'
- [Maldonado (1999: 3573)]

3. Johnson (2001) presents examples of VP-topicalization within embedded clauses, like those in (i):  
 (i) Madame Spanella claimed that  
 a) eat rutabagas, Holly wouldn't  
 b) eaten rutabagas, Holly hasn't  
 c) eating rutabagas, Holly should be.

While in the direct quote (the host sentence) the person and number features of the subject pronoun and the  $\phi$ -features of the verb are independent of those of the parenthetical verb (see (13a) and (14a)), this is not so in indirect speech reporting clauses (13b) and (14b). Thus in (13a) *eu* ('I') and *Mário* refer to the same entity, but in (13c) they refer to different entities, in contrast with (13b) where *Mário* and (*ele*) ('he') denote the same entity. Similarly, while in (13a) the verb in the quote is in the first person singular and the verb in the quotative parenthetical occurs in the third person singular, in (13b) both verbs share the same person and number features, the third person singular.

Also, while the verb tense values of the direct quote and the parenthetical sentences are independent, in indirect speech reporting clauses, the verb of the main sentence may determine the tense value of the subordinate clause, (15):

- (15) a. O livro é caro?, perguntou o Mário.  
           the book be.PRS expensive?, ask.PAST the Mário  
           'Is the book expensive?, asked Mário.'
- b. O Mário perguntou se o livro era caro.  
           the Mário ask.PAST if the book be.PAST expensive  
           'Mário asked if the book was expensive.'

Moreover, in languages like Portuguese or Spanish, the lexical features of a main verb may require the presence of Subjunctive in their argument clauses, (16b). In contrast, the parenthetical verb does not constrain the mood of the host sentence (16a):

- (16) a. O livro é muito caro! — lamentou o Mário.  
           the book be.INDIC too expensive complain.PAST the Mário  
           'The book is too expensive! — complained Mário.'
- b. O Mário lamentou que o livro fosse / \*era muito  
           the Mário complain.PAST that the book be.SUBJ be.INDIC too  
           caro.  
           expensive  
           'Mário complain that that book was too expensive.'

In addition, the host sentence (the quote) does not exhibit an overt complementizer, (17)-(18), but the presence of this complementizer is required in embedded sentences in Portuguese (19a) and Spanish (19b), an example based on Maldonado (1999: 3571-2572):

- (17) a. Este livro é muito caro!, disse o Mário.  
           this book is too expensive! said the Mário
- b. ??\*Que este livro é muito caro!, disse o Mário.  
           that this book is too expensive said the Mário

- (18) a. Estoy cansada y quiero irme a dormir, dijo María.  
           am tired and want go.REFL to sleep said María  
           'I am tired and I want to sleep, said Maria.'
- b. \*Que estoy cansada y que quiero irme a dormir, dijo Maria.  
           that am tired and that wanted go.REFL to sleep said Maria
- (19) a. Mário disse \*(que) este livro era muito caro.  
           Mário said that this book was too expensive
- b. María dijo \*(que) estaba cansada y que quería irse a dormir.  
           María said that was tired and that wanted go.REFL to sleep  
           'María said (that) she was tired and that she wanted to sleep.'

Finally, the Specifier-head-complement analysis is problematic, since it reverses the speaker communicative purposes. In fact, it assumes that the alleged embedded sentence, the dependent one, is converted into the host clause, that is to say, the main sentence, while the supposed main sentence, i.e. the governing sentence, is turned into a dependent clause containing extra information. This change in the dependence relations is unexpected, considering that fronting of a constituent to the left periphery of a sentence does not have, in itself, the property of converting this element into a quote sentence and the main clause into spare information.

In sum, the Complement Hypothesis and the specifier-head-complement structural configuration, in general, do not adequately deal with quotative parentheticals.

## 2.2. *The null operator and the connection between the host sentence and the parenthetical*

Most current analyses accept that the parenthetical is indirectly related to the host sentence by a null operator, tacitly or overtly assuming the independence of the quote regarding the quotative parenthetical. This approach has been proposed for European Portuguese by Ambar (1992), for English by Collins (1997) and Collins and Branigan (1997), and for Spanish by Suñer (2000). Disregarding the functional projections inside CP, these authors propose a similar structural representation for the parenthetical clause:<sup>4</sup>

- (20) [CP [OP]<sub>i</sub> [ V<sub>j</sub> [ DP<sub>SUBJECT</sub> V<sub>j</sub> [-]<sub>i</sub> ] ] ]

In this representation, a null operator, arising from the movement of the null object of the verb, moves to the specifier of CP and binds its copy (signalled as [-] in (20)), which interpreted as a variable at the relevant level of interpretation. Ambar suggests that the content of the null operator is set by the host sentence,

4. See also, for Dutch, a V2 language, similar proposals by Cover and Tiersh (2002) and De Vries (2006).



extending the proposal of Raposo (1986) for Null Objects in European Portuguese;<sup>5</sup> Collins and Branigan, and Suñer claim that it is a null Quotative operator «controlled by the quote» (Collins and Branigan 1997: 13).

Ambar did not present any proposal to account for the structural relation between the parenthetical and its host. Still, Collins and Branigan as well as Suñer think that these clauses are related by adjunction. The former authors claim that the quotative parenthetical adjoins to the quote, possibly to CP (Collins and Branigan 1997: 10), but do not develop their analysis. In turn, Suñer (2000) considers that the quotative parenthetical is the main sentence and it is the quote that adjoins to it: when the quote follows the parenthetical, it adjoins to the DP object gap, [DP -], bound by the null quotative operator, [OP], as illustrated in (21b):

- (21) a. [Ella ...] le dice: ¡Papá! ¿Qué hace usted ahí?  
 she him said daddy what does you there  
 ‘She says to him: Dad! What are you doing here?’  
 [Son84 apud Suñer (2000)]
- b. [ForceP [OP]<sub>i</sub> [F [+QUOTATIVE]]] [TP ella le dice [DP [DP -]<sub>i</sub> [¡Papá! ¿Qué hace usted ahí?]]]

When the quote is totally or partially fronted, the fronted expression adjoins to the quotative operator, as represented in (22b):

- (22) a. «¡Claro!», comprendió el viejo, les ha dicho el médico.  
of course!, understood the old man them has said the doctor  
‘Of course, understood the old man, the doctor has told them.’  
[*Son* 76, apud Suñer (2000)]
- b. [ForceP [Claro! [OP]<sub>i</sub>] [Force +QUOTATIVE,+FOCUS] [TP comprendió el  
viejo [DP [DP -]<sub>i</sub>] les ha dicho el médico] ] ] ]

According to Suñer, the quote is fronted when it is attracted by a [+FOCUS] feature of Force. This [+FOCUS] feature will account for the strong stress of the fronted quote that contrasts with the flat/parenthetical intonation of the quotative reporting clause.

Suñer's analysis to capture the correlation between the quote and the reporting clause presents some problems. Since she presumes that the original position of the quote is in adjunction to the null object copy, she cannot explain why movement is possible, given that adjunct clauses are not typically fronted from the DPs that contain them and extraction of out of adjuncts produces island effects. This is

5. Raposo (1986) assumes that Null Objects in European Portuguese behave as described in Huang (1984) for Chinese. Developing his analysis, Raposo (2006) considers that the null object in European Portuguese is a DP headed by a definite null D that selects a *pro* as its complement. Given that *pro* may not be licensed by the null D, it has to raise to a functional projection, leaving a copy that is interpreted as a bound variable. In both papers, Raposo accepts that a null topic establishes the content of the null operator that binds the variable in object position.

shown for European Portuguese in (23), where an adjunct gerundive clause modifies the object DP of the main clause:

- (23) a. O programa trazia [instruções [indicando a sua correcta  
the program brought instructions indicating the its correct  
instalação]].  
installation  
'The program brought instructions indicating its correct installation.'
- b. \*Indicando a sua correcta instalação, o programa trazia  
indicating the its correct installation, the program brought  
instruções.  
instructions
- c. \*Indicando, o programa trazia instruções a sua correcta  
indicating, the program brought instructions the its correct  
instalação.  
installation

In addition, as Suñer recognizes, her analysis is not able to deal with examples like (6b), repeated in (24), since movement of a non-constituent is not sanctioned by the grammar:

- (24) Mary will, John said, see you tomorrow.

Finally, Suñer assumes that fronting accounts for the strong stress of the quote in contrast with the parenthetical intonation. Thus, her proposal leaves unexplained how the non-fronted part of the quote gets its non-parenthetical stress.

Considering these problems, I will take a more classical view of parenthetical adjunction, by assuming that it is the parenthetical that adjoins to the host clause. I will return to this proposal in section 4.1.

### 3. Previous analyses on subject inversion in quotative parentheticals

Within Principles and Parameters, different proposals have been developed to deal with subject inversion in quotative parentheticals which varied according to language and the framework adopted. In this section I will review the proposals centered on English and the peninsular languages under study.<sup>6</sup>

In Government and Binding framework, Ambar (1992) conceives the mandatory subject inversion in parentheticals in European Portuguese (cf. (25)) as the result of verb raising to C to void barrierhood of TP and allow the binding of the variable by the null operator in the specifier of CP.

6. For German and Dutch much work on this kind of parentheticals treats subject inversion as an instance of the V2 phenomenon, at least for some subtypes of parentheticals (see, a.o, Steinbach 2007, Corver and Tiersh 2002 and De Vries 2006).

- (25) a. «Alguém telefonou?», perguntou a Maria.  
           anybody called?, asked the Maria  
           «Did anybody called?» asked Mary.
- b. \*«Alguém telefonou?», a Maria perguntou.  
           anybody called?, the Maria asked  
           «Did anybody called?» Mary asked.

This explanation is no longer possible within current framework. In addition, it is contradicted by English, which presents quotative parentheticals without subject inversion.

Within early Minimalism Collins and Branigan's (1997) argued that *Quotative Inversion* in English only occurs when a CP with a [+QUOTE] feature also exhibits a strong V- feature that must be checked by the main verb. The main V overtly moves out of VP, raising to the most local functional head in the sentence, according to them AGRO; then, it covertly moves to check the strong V-feature of C. To account for the fact that the subject remains in specifier of VP, they assume that a C [+QUOTE] may optionally select a T with a weak N- feature and consequently no EPP feature of T must be checked. The resulting configuration for the parenthetical clause in (26) would look like (27):

- (26) «Who's on first?» demanded Joe.

- (27) [CP [OP]<sub>i</sub>: [C +QUOTE, V\_STRONG], [TP [T N\_WEAK] [AGR\_OP demanded<sub>k</sub>  
           [VP Joe  
           [VP demanded<sub>k</sub> [-]<sub>i</sub>]]]]]

The authors claim that the main verb does not raise to T in Quotative Inversion, by arguing that it may not be negated, (28a,b), in contrast with what happens in quotative sentences without subject-verb inversion (28c). They argue that the main verb raises to AGR\_O, on the basis of the positions presented by VP-external adverbs, which they assume to adjoin to AGR\_O, (29):

- (28) a. \*«Let's eat!», said not John but once.  
       b. \*«Let's eat!», not said John but once.  
       c. «Let's eat!», John did not say but once.

[Collins and Branigan (1997)]

- (29) a. «Pass the pepper, please.», politely requested Anna.

- b. \*«Pass the pepper, please.», requested politely Anna.

[Collins and Branigan (1997)]

Collins (1997) takes a different view. He assumes that in Quotative Inversion, the verb raises to T in overt Syntax and the post-verbal subject remains in specifier

of Tr(ansitive)P, a projection above VP, presumably  $\nu$ P in the current framework. In this case the quotative operator firstly adjoins to TrP to check its case feature, and then moves to the specifier of TP to check the EPP feature of T (like in Locative Inversion), as illustrated in (30a). In contrast when there is no Quotative Inversion, the verb stays in VP, OP remains in TrP, and the subject moves to the specifier of TP to check the EPP features, as shown in (30b):

- (30) a. [TP [OP]<sub>i</sub> [T<sub>EPP</sub> warned] [TrP [-]<sub>i</sub> [TrP Joe [VPwarned [-]<sub>i</sub>]]]]  
 b. [TP Joe [T<sub>EPP</sub>] [TrP [OP]<sub>i</sub> [TrP Joe [VP warned [-]<sub>i</sub>]]]]

In opposition to Collins and Branigan (1997), Collins (1997) interprets the impossibility of auxiliaries in Quotative Inversion, (31a,b), as evidence that the main verb has raised to T, differently from what happens in quotative parentheticals without inversion, where auxiliaries may occur, (31c):<sup>7</sup>

- (31) a. \*«What time is it?» was asking John of Mona.  
 b. \*«What time is it?» was John asking of Mona.  
 c. «What time is it?» John was asking of Mona. [Collins (1997)]

He correlates this raising with the impossibility of sentence negation, (28), by positing that a main verb may never raise over negation, overtly or covertly.<sup>8</sup> He also suggests that adverb placement in sentences like (29a) is a case of adjunction to TP or T'.

Extending these proposals, Suñer (2000) argues that Quotative Inversion in Spanish and English is related to the presence of two different categories to check the EPP-features of T: an expletive *pro* in Spanish, a null subject language, and a null definite description in English. She correlates the difference between these null categories with the distinct status of the quotative operator: in English the null operator raises to the specifier of TP, an A-position (Collins 1997), hence the null subject is interpreted as a null constant; in Spanish, since the null operator raises to an A'-position, it is understood as an anaphoric operator, and the subject position is occupied by *pro* (cf. (32)):

- (32) [ForceP [OP]<sub>i</sub>: [Force +QUOTATIVE, ...] [TP *pro* comprendió ... [vP el viejo comprendió [-]<sub>i</sub> ]

Suñer also points out that the quotative clause in Spanish presents some structural differences with respect to English. In particular she remarks that the posi-

7. Collins and Branigan (1997) present an example with the auxiliary *have* and attribute its marginality to the fact that the main verb cannot covertly raise to C to check the +QUOTE V-feature of C without violating Minimality (Minimal Link Condition):

(i) ???«What time is it?» – had asked Perry of Mona.

8. Collins (1997) assumes that there is no true explanation for this fact.



Thus, like Suñer (2000), I assume that in Quotative Inversion the main verb moves to T in European Portuguese and Spanish while it raises to Asp in English.<sup>9</sup>

In sum, Collins (1997), Collins and Branigan (1997) and Suñer (2000), present analyses that deal with subject inversion in quotative clauses in English and Spanish. However they do not account for the fact that in quotative parentheticals, the V-S order is obligatory in Spanish (as and Portuguese) and is optional in English. I will return to this subject in section 4.2.

#### 4. A proposal on quotative parentheticals and quotative inversion

Elaborating on the analyses presented in the previous sections, I will present a proposal that tries to account for the structural relation that the parenthetical establishes with the quote as well as for the contrast between English and the peninsular languages under study concerning subject inversion in quotative parentheticals.

##### 4.1. *Quotative parentheticals as adjuncts to the host clause*

The arguments presented in section 2.2 favour Collins and Branigan's proposal that the quotative parenthetical is an adjunct of the host clause. Although accepting this proposal, I will not adopt their suggestion that this adjunction is restricted to CP, in view of the fact that the parenthetical may occupy different positions inside its host. I claim that the quotative parenthetical may adjoin to the different functional projections of the host sentence.<sup>10</sup> It may left adjoin to TP, AspP and vP or right adjoin to CP/ForceP as represented in (38). As far as left adjunction is concerned, these parentheticals behave like adverbs, accepting the analysis proposed by Costa (2004a).

- (38) a. Eles (disse a Ana) têm (disse a Ana) posto (disse a Ana) o seu  
 they said the Ana have said the Ana put said the Ana their  
 dinheiro no banco (disse a Ana).  
 money in-the bank said the Ana
- b. [[CP/ForceP [TP eles [TP@[TP têm[AspP@[AspP posto[vP @ [vP posto o seu  
 dinheiro no banco]]]]]]@].

I also consider that the parenthetical nature of the quotative sentence is codified by a feature in its CP/ForceP domain as an instruction for the interface levels to interpret the adjoined clause like a constituent not fully structurally integrated in the host sentence. Thus, I propose for these clauses the simplified structural representation in (39):

9. Adopting this view, the proposals of Collins and Branigan (1997) concerning sentence negation and the ban of auxiliaries in Quotative Inversion in English must be reconsidered as an option.  
 10. A similar claim has been assumed for other kinds of floating parenthetical clauses; see Potts 2002, 2005 for "as parentheticals" or Matos and Colaço 2010 for floating coordinate sentences.

(39) ...[ForceP, Parent [Force decl(arative), parent(hetical)] [[OP]i:... [vP ...[-i]]]

In (39), Force presents declarative (assertive) illocutionary force, characteristic of reporting speech parentheticals, which may differ from the illocutionary force of the quote sentence, as illustrated by examples like (3b) («*Who's on first?*» *Joe demanded*). The null quotative operator is merged in a functional projection above vP, in Spanish and European Portuguese, possibly TopP, and binds the object variable. The content of the chain formed by the null operator and the variable is recovered by the quote. This recovery is only legitimate at the level of interpretation if there is compatibility between the lexical semantic features of the parenthetical reporting verb concerning the selection of its complements and the illocutionary force of the quote, as shown by the following contrasts:<sup>11</sup>

- (40) a. «I am not stupid!» John exclaimed / said /\*asked. *English*  
 b. «¿Quién ha llegado tarde?» Preguntó / \*afirmó Juan. *Spanish*  
     who has arrived late asked said Juan  
 c. «O Pedro vai chegar tarde.» Disse / \*preguntou / \*exclamou o *EP*  
     João.  
     the Pedro will arrive late. said asked exclaimed the  
     João  
     ‘Peter will arrive late today. Said / asked / exclaimed João.’

In sum, the analysis presented in this section seems to be able to account for the structural and discursive properties of the parenthetical and capture its correlation with the host sentence.

#### 4.2. Obligatory vs. optional subject inversion in quotative parentheticals

European Portuguese and Spanish differ from English by requiring obligatory Subject-Verb inversion in quotative parentheticals, as shown in (41)-(42) versus (43). However, previous analyses did not consider this contrast (Ambar 1992, Suñer 2000, Collins 1997, Collins and Branigan 1997).

- (41) Saramago, disse o repórter / \*o reporter disse, ganhou um prémio  
     Saramago, said the reporter/ the reporter said, won a prize  
     Nobel  
     Nobel  
     ‘Saramago, said the reporter/ the reporter said, won the Nobel prize.’  
 (42) «No, no es un enanito», rectifica el viejo / \*el viejo rectifica.  
     no, not is a gnome corrects the old man the old man corrects  
     ‘No, he is not a gnome, corrects the old man.’

11. I thank an anonymous reviewer for making me aware of this problem.

(43) «Who's on first?» Joe demanded/demanded Joe.

I assume that these word order patterns are connected with the discursive value of the subject of the parenthetical clause, which is interpreted as an informational focus, a property that seems to be related to the pragmatic reporting value of these parentheticals. In European Portuguese and Spanish, informational focus subjects occur in post-verbal position, fronted focus being restricted to contrastive focus (see, a. o., Costa 1998, 2000, 2004 for European Portuguese; and Zubizarreta 1998, Ordoñez and Treviño 1999, Suñer 2000 for Spanish). In opposition, in English, subjects presenting informational focus typically occur in preverbal position. The non-marked positions of informational focus subjects in these languages are captured in answers to wh-questions that focus on the subject, as shown in (44)-(46):

(44) Q: Quem (é que) disse isso? *European Portuguese*  
           who is that said that  
           'Who said that?'

A: Disse a Maria. said the Maria 'Mary did.'	B: #/??A Maria disse. the Maria said 'Mary did.'
--	--

(45) Q: ¿Quién lo dijo? *Spanish*  
           Who CL.ACC said

A: Lo dijo María. CL.ACC said María 'Mary did.'	B: #/??María lo dijo María CL.ACC said 'Mary did.'
---	--

(46) Q: Who said that? *English*  
       A: Mary did.  
       B: \*Did Mary.

Assuming that in Quotative Inversion the subject of the parenthetical clause is understood as an informational focus, and adopting Rizzi's (1997) CP system, I claim that, in English Quotative parentheticals, Force selects Focus(P), a discursive functional projection that, depending on the language, may present [ $\pm$ CONTRASTIVE] features. Focus [- CONTRASTIVE] will be understood as informational focus. I also claim that, when projected, Focus has an underspecified categorial feature that must be valued during the derivation. Thus, accepting the core proposals of Collins (1997) with respect to the possible landing sites of the null Quotative Operator, the basic structure of a quotative parenthetical in English, may be represented as in (47):

(47) [ForceP, Parent [Force DECL, PARENT]][FocP[Foc -CONTRASTIVE, cat= $\alpha$ ]  
       [TP ...[OP]i:...[vP ... [-]i]



When the quotative parenthetical exhibits a preverbal subject, as in (46), the subject raises to the specifier of TP to value the uninterpretable EPP and  $\phi$  features of T. Then, it raises to specifier of FocP to value the categorial feature of Focus as DP. The verb stays inside vP, the projection where, according to Collins (1997), the quotative operator adjoins to in this case:

(48) a. Who's on first? Joe demanded.

b. [ForceP, Parent [Force DECL, PARENT]][FocP Joej [Foc – CONTRASTIVE, cat=DP]...[TP T [OP]k[vP Joej demanded [-k]]]]

However, in Quotative Inversion construction, English still has in current (written) language a marked strategy for informational focus subjects. In this case, OP raises to Spec,T to check EPP features of T and the uninterpretable categorial feature of Focus is valued, at long distance by Agree with the DP subject in Spec,vP, provided that the main verb raises out of the vP phase to the most local functional head above vP, extending its domain to the next phase, CP, (49b):

(49) a. Who's on first? demanded Joe.

b. [ForceP, Parent [Force decl, parent]][FocP [Foc –contrastive, cat=DP]... [TP [OP]idemandedk [[-]i [vP Joe demandedk [-]i ]]]]

In opposition, in languages like European Portuguese and Spanish, Focus in the left periphery of the sentence is restricted to contrastive focus. Since quotative parentheticals, involves informational focus on the subject, Foc in the left periphery is not selected and does not project. The verb moves to T and informational focus subjects remain in the specifier of vP, as proposed by Costa 1998, 2000, 2004b, for European Portuguese (focus in situ) or alternatively the postverbal subject raises to the specifier of FocP in the sentence low area above vP, as argued by Belletti (2004). In this paper I will adopt the analysis of Costa (2004b), which minimizes the number of functional projections required, leaving for further work a discussion of the adequacy of each one of these proposals.

Considering that the quotative null operator in European Portuguese and Spanish occurs in an A' position (Ambar 1992, Suñer 2000) and recovers its content from the surrounding context, the quote, I will assume that it is a Null Object (Ambar 1992), derived as in Raposo (1986, 2004). Accepting Rizzi's (1997) left periphery, I will claim it is merged in TopP.<sup>12</sup> Thus, the representation of the parenthetical in a sentence like (50a), would look like (50b):

12. As remarked in Suñer (2000), Spanish (i), in contrast with English, (ii), allows different word order patterns of postverbal subjects in quotative inversion. Once again, European Portuguese parallels to Spanish, (iii):

(i) a. – Fuego! – gritaram todos los vecinos con desesperación.  
fire shouted all the neighbors with despair  
b. – Fuego! – gritaram com desesperación todos los vecinos. [Suñer (2000)]  
fire shouted with despair all the neighbors.

- (50) a. É tarde! – disse o rapaz.  
           is late      said the boy.  
           ‘It is late! – said the boy.’
- b. [ForceP, Parenth [Force decl, parent] [TopP [OP]<sub>i</sub> [FinP ] [TP pro disse [vP o rapaz  
           disse [-]<sub>i</sub>]]]

According to this proposal, the obligatory V-S pattern in Quotative Inversion in European Portuguese and Spanish, and the S-V/V-S alternation in English find an explanation in discursive purpose of the reporting clause and syntactic strategies available in these languages to capture them.

## 5. Final remarks

In this paper I have argued that quotative parentheticals do not originate as main clauses that select the quote as its complement. Despite exhibiting a gap in object position, there is no basis to claim that this gap resulted from the displacement of the quote to the left periphery of the indirect speech reporting clause. The problems faced by the specifier-head-complement configuration and the empirical evidence showed that the host sentence and the quotative parenthetical are related but independent clauses. The floating status of the parenthetical indicates that it should be analysed as a main autonomous clause that adjoins to the functional categories of the host sentence. Thus, the object gap of the verb of the parenthetical must be understood as a variable bound by a null operator which content is established by the quote sentence.

Considering the discursive informational structure of the parenthetical clause, I assume that quotative inversion is related to informational focus on the subject. I claim that the word order alternations involving the verb and the subject in quota-

---

(ii) a. “John left,” said the student to Mary.

b. \*John left” said to Mary the student.

[Collins (1997)]

(iii) a. É tarde! – disse o rapaz ao amigo.

          is late      said the boy to-the friend

          ‘It is late! – said the boy to his friend.’

b. É tarde! – disse ao amigo o rapaz.

          is late      said to-the friend the boy.

These data show that in Spanish and European Portuguese, informational focus may include the postverbal subject and its complement or modifier, as in (ia) and (iiia), or it may have scope only over the subject in the rightmost position of the verbal phrase (cf. Zubizarreta 1998, Costa 2004b), as in (ib) and (iiib). Different proposals have been put forth to account for the derivation of these cases. As for the sentences in (ib) and (iiib), it has been argued that the subject stays in Spec,vP (Costa 1998, 2004b) and its complement or modifier adjoins to the left of vP, as in scrambling (Costa 1998, 2004b).

However, the unavailability of subjects in the rightmost position in English Quotative Inversion suggests that, as proposed in Ordóñez (2006) considering Spanish and Catalan, in Spanish and European Portuguese subjects may occupy two different positions in the sentence low area, while one of these positions is unavailable in English. In this paper I will not pursue this question.

tive parentheticals in the languages under study is a consequence of the structural patterns currently available in these languages to account for informational focus subjects. The obligatory Subject Inversion in European Portuguese and Spanish has to do with the fact that in these languages preverbal focus is restricted to contrastive focus. In contrast, the optionality of preverbal and postverbal subjects in English is related to the fact that in this language preverbal focus may or may not present a contrastive value; hence informational focus subjects typically precede the verb in current language. However, in Quotative Inversion, subject informational focus in postverbal position is still allowed in current language.

## References

- Ambar, Manuela (1992). *Para uma sintaxe da inversão sujeito-verbo em português*. Lisboa: Colibri.
- Belletti, Adriana (2004). «Aspects of the low IP area». In: Rizzi, Luigi (ed.). *The structure of CP and IP*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 16-51.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads - A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York/Oxford: OUP.
- Collins, Chris (1997). *Local economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Collins, Chris; Branigan, Phillip (1997). «Quotative inversion». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5.1: 1-41.
- Corver, Norbert; Tiersh, Craig (2002). «Remarks on parentheticals». In: Oosterdorp, Marc van; Agnastopoulou, Elena (eds.). *Progress in grammar: articles at the 20th anniversary of the comparison of grammatical models in Tilburg*. Utrecht: Roquade. <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/books>
- Costa, João (1998). *Word order variation*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Costa, João (2000). «Focus in situ: Evidence from Portuguese». *Probus* 12: 187-228.
- Costa, João (2004a). «A multifactorial approach to adverb placement: assumptions, facts, and problems». *Lingua*, 114: 711-753.
- Costa, João (2004b). *Subject positions and interfaces: The case of European Portuguese*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Costa, João (2010). «Prosodic prominence: a syntactic matter?». In: Erteshick-Shir, Nomi; Rochman, Lisa (eds.). *The sound patterns of syntax*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 93-109.
- De Vries, Mark (2006). «Reported direct speech in Dutch». *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23: 212-223.
- Emonds, Joseph (1970). «Parenthetical clauses». In: Corum, Claudia; Smith-Stark, Cedric; Weiser, Anne (eds.). *You take the high node and I'll take the low node. Papers from the Comparative Syntax Festival*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society, pp. 333-347.
- Espinal, Maria-Teresa (1991). «The representation of disjunct constituents». *Language*, 67: 726-762.
- Huang, James (1984). «On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns». *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531-574.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972). *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Johnson, Kyle. 2001. «What VP-ellipsis can do, and what it can't, but not why». In: Baltin, Mark; Collins, Chris (eds). *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Oxford/Boston: Blackwell, pp. 439-479.
- Kayne, Richard (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Maldonado, Concepción (1999). «Discurso directo y discurso indirecto». In: Bosque, Ignacio; Demonte, Violeta (dirs.). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa, pp. 3549-3595.
- Matos, Gabriela; Colaço, Madalena (2009). «Floating parenthetical coordination». In: Tork, Danièle; Wetzels, Leo W. (eds.). *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2006*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 203-221.
- Ordóñez, Francisco (2006). «Cartography of postverbal subjects in Spanish and Catalan». In: Baauw, Sergio; Drijkoningen, Frank; Pinto, Manuela (eds.). *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2005*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 259-280.
- Ordóñez, Francisco; Treviño, Esthela (1999). «Left dislocated subjects and the pro-drop parameter: a case study of Spanish». *Lingua* 107: 39-68.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). «Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP». *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20.3: 365-424.
- Potts, Christopher (2002). «The syntax and semantics of *as*-parentheticals». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20: 623-689.
- Raposo, Eduardo (1986). «On the null object in European Portuguese». In: Jaeggli, Osvaldo; Silva-Corvalán, Carmen (eds.). *Studies on Romance linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, pp. 373-390.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues on Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). «The fine structure of the left periphery». In: Haegeman, Liliane (ed.). *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 63-90.
- Rooryck, Johan (2001). «Evidentiality, part I». *Glott International*, Vol. 5.4: 125-133.
- Ross, John (1973). «Slifting». In: Gross, Maurice; Halle, Morris; Schützenberger, M-P (eds.). *The formal analysis of natural languages. Proceedings of the first international conference*. De Hague-Mouton, pp. 133-169.
- Steinbach, Markus (2007). «Integrated parentheticals and assertional complements». In: Déhé, Nicole; Kavalova, Yordana (eds.). *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 53-87.
- Suñer, Margarita (2000). «The syntax of direct quotes with special reference to Spanish and English». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 18: 525-578.
- Zubizarreta, Maria-Luisa (1998). *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.